## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION

CORDELLRA MCCALEY

**PLAINTIFF** 

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:20-CV-298-DPJ-FKB

DEPUTY WARDEN JAMES FILLYAW, ET AL.

**DEFENDANTS** 

## **ORDER**

Plaintiff Cordellra McCaley filed this § 1983 suit challenging the conditions of his confinement at the Central Mississippi Correctional Facility (CMCF). On October 21, 2020, he filed a "Motion for Injunction Relief" [sic] seeking an injunction "against Defendants at Central Miss Correctional Facility." Mot. [24] at 1. On December 29, 2020, McCaley was transferred from CMCF to the Mississippi State Penitentiary at Parchman. Notice [26]. United States Magistrate Judge F. Keith Ball then entered a Report and Recommendation [37] recommending the Court deny McCaley's motion and noting that McCaley "cannot meet the requirement of irreparable injury because he is no longer housed at CMCF." R&R [37] at 2; see Women's Medical Ctr. of Nw. Hous. v. Bell, 248 F.3d 411, 419 n.15 (5th Cir. 2001) (listing elements required to obtain injunctive relief as including "a substantial threat that plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury").

McCaley filed an Objection [38] to Judge Ball's R&R, as well as two Notices [39, 40] detailing issues he says he is having at Parchman. In his Objection, he says that his experience at his "new prison will likely be similar to" that at CMCF. Obj. [38] at 1. But a prisoner's transfer from the facility on which his lawsuit is based generally renders claims for injunctive relief against prison officials at the transferor facility moot. *Herman v. Holiday*, 238 F.3d 660, 665 (5th Cir. 2001). And McCaley never addressed Judge Ball's conclusion that he "failed to allege

facts indicating that he can meet the[] prerequisites" for an injunction. R&R [37] at 2. Judge Ball correctly concluded McCaley has not shown entitlement to an injunction against CMCF personnel. McCaley's Objection [38] is overruled, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation [37] as its opinion, and McCaley's Motion [24] is denied.<sup>1</sup>

**SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this the 18th day of June, 2021.

s/ Daniel P. Jordan III
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If McCaley wishes to challenge the conditions at his new facility, he would need to address those issues in a separate suit against the proper defendants.